DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 576 JC 710 231

TITLE	Junior College Staffing 1975-1980.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Univ., Normal. Center for Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	55p.; Proceedings of a seminar conducted by the Center for Higher Education, Illinois State University, Normal, April 29-30, 1971
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Differentiated Staffs; Faculty; *Instructional Staff; *Junior Colleges; *Manpower Needs; *Personnel Needs; Staff Role; Staff Utilization; Teachers

ABSTRACT

Anticipated junior college staffing problems for the years 1975 to 1980 were considered and discussed in a seminar setting. Several specific position papers were presented to start the discussion. They covered such topics as: modeling needs for long-term staff planning in the public comprehensive community college; need dimensions for staffing community colleges in the seventies; the who, where, why, and how of staffing community colleges; university programs for the 1970s; and future staff development for community colleges. Following each of the major papers is a selected list of questions and answers representing the actual discussion. Also included is a list of major topics and resolutions coming from smaller, more specialized sub-groups. Reports from the sub-groups, designated for the specialized areas of administration, business, and humanities, were forthcoming. (AL)

EDO 55576

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Junior College Staffing 1975-1980

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEMINAR
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

JC 710 231

APRIL 29-30, 1971

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

OCT 29 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	ii
Program	1
Needed: A Model for Long-Term Planning for Staffing the Public Comprehensive Community College Robert L. Poorman	2
The Dimensions of Need for Staffing the Community Colleges During the Seventies James L. Wattenbarger	6
Staffing the Community Colleges: Who, Where, Why, and How James L. Wattenbarger	17
University Programs for the 1970's Richard R. Bond	31
Valedictory Fred L. Wellman	36
Group Discussions	42
Participants	49

PREFACE

Illinois State University places special emphasis on the preparation of college teachers in its current and future graduate programs. The Center for Higher Education expedites this mission by offering aid to University faculty members on experimentation, evaluation, and improvement of their own teaching. Center members are also active in consulting with junior and private colleges in the state and midwestern region.

These proceedings are the record of a seminar organized and directed by the Center involving virtually all departments of the University and a majority of the Illinois public junior colleges in looking at the future needs of junior college staffing and their educational implications. This is the first of a series of seminars focusing on long-term planning related to the junior colleges. The seminar was organized and directed by Gerald W. Smith, Professor of Higher Education, at the University.

Richard L. Desmond, Director
Center for Higher Education

July, 1971

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
SEMINARS ON PLANNING

SEMINAR - JUNIOR COLLEGE STAFFING, 1975-1980
Ramada Inn, April 29-30, 1971

PROGRAM

Thursday, April 29

5:00-6:30 Registration

6:30-8:30 Dinner Session
Richard L. Desmond, Director, Center for Higher Education, Assistant Dean of Faculties, Illinois State University, presiding
"Needed: A Model for Long-Range Planning for Staffing the Public Comprehensive Community College"
Robert L. Poorman, President
Lincoln Land Community College
"The Dimensions of Need for Staffing the Community Colleges During the Seventies"
James Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida
Discussion

8:30-9:30 Group Discussions

English-Communications	Fine Arts
Math and Sciences	Applied Science and Technology
Social Sciences	Administration
Humanities	Guidance and Counseling
Business	

Friday, April 30

9:00 General Session
Earl Trobaugh, President, Illinois Valley Community College, presiding
"Staffing the Community Colleges: Who, Where, Why, and How"
James Wattenbarger
Discussion

10:30-12:00 Group Discussions

12:00-1:00 Luncheon

1:00-3:00 General Session
William Gnagey, Professor of Psychology, Illinois State University, presiding
"University Programs for the 1970's"
Richard Bond, Vice President and Dean of Faculties
Illinois State University
"Valedictory"
Fred L. Wellman, Executive Secretary
Illinois Junior College Board

NEEDED: A MODEL FOR LONG-RANGE PLANNING FOR STAFFING THE PUBLIC COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Robert L. Poorman, President
Lincoln Land Community College

I would like to suggest that the comments I will make are directed more at the junior college representatives than to our university friends. But, I am pleased that they will be here to acknowledge that junior college people have some homework to do.

The current status of long-range planning for community colleges ranges from "hand-to-mouth" to sophisticated models. I would suggest to you that more of us are living in staffing planning on the basis of hand-to-mouth. Long-range planning asks many questions, and that is all I'll do. I am not suggesting a <u>model</u> for that long-range planning, but only an ordering of some of the factors which are going to bear on our needs and how we use our instructors in years ahead. There are model-makers for all kinds of planning, but I also know that model-makers sometimes don't get input from practitioners. I am that, and many of the junior college representatives here are practitioners who I think can provide the model-makers, such as representatives from WICHE, some of the variables that we need to think about.

I apologized to one of the Illinois State University deans at this meeting by saying you are going to ask us perfectly legitimate questions about our needs, and we must do a lot of homework in the junior colleges before we can <u>answer</u> your questions with effectiveness.

As an old registrar, I must observe that we still haven't come very far in the business of doing decent enrollment projecting, and that is pretty basic to telling university people what our needs are. Most of us are in the "dark ages" stage of grade-progression and attrition models for gauging how many students we are going to have. This may give us all of a three-year lead time in effective enrollment projection. I don't think that's too good. Hitting the numbers by chance isn't enough. We pat ourselves on the back when we say from one year to the next, "Look, we projected 3900 students head count and we got 3910 head count." I don't think that's good planning. I think we have to come to the point where we can <u>analyze</u> why we arrived at the right numbers and quit just patting ourselves on the back that we came close. Specifically, one of the variables that we have to address ourselves to in a model is the question of how to gauge part-time enrollment. We do pretty well on saying we know how many full-timers we had last year, and we'll grind in X percent on full-time students. On our part-timers, we don't do nearly so well. When will we have plumbed the backlog of students who wish to attend? When do the repeaters in our program start coming back? An example of other variables that we struggled with for a long time is the relationship between population and our enrollment. What's going to happen if there is a difference in enrollment due to draft deferments? What's tuition going to do to us? What about the effect of financial aid? What about the effect of new buildings? If we <u>get</u> new buildings, are we going to have different types of enrollment? We haven't even addressed ourselves to the question of what happens to the junior colleges if the economy plunges. The university diversion that may

come to us as limits are set upon university enrollments is most certainly going to affect us. We haven't answered how yet.

After we get a head count, if we get a reasonably good one, I'd ask the question, "What about our graduation requirements?" In the high schools in a fixed curriculum for a number of students, we know how many sections are required and, thus, the number of teachers required. If we change graduation requirements along the line, we are going to change our teacher needs. We are still not too good at the business of projecting the choices of majors, and that is not so astounding. Many of our young people coming in don't know what their majors are going to be.

In the area of organization and general administration, there are a number of questions we are going to have to ask at home. One of them is, "What is going to happen to our need for instructors as the non-junior college territory in this State shrinks and those areas come into the junior colleges?" Yes, I know we can count how many "charge-backs" we have now, but we are not quite sure whether that number will diminish. When is the State going to blanket Illinois with junior college districts? We can't do much long-range planning until we know what our district arrangements are going to be.

If I could move to administrative staffing for just a moment--how many of us are ultimately going to be multi-campus? Those districts which have become multi-campus have a new ballgame in administrative staffing. If many of us go multi-campus, are we going to have needs for different kinds of administrators? I would like to pose the question of staffing for institutional research. If we keep asking all of these kinds of questions before we can plan for more than one year at a time, it seems to me that we must have trained institutional research people who have been on the firing line long enough to know how to ask the right questions. The second one that we touched briefly upon this afternoon, although we didn't know we were doing it, was "What is going to be the position in our administrative organization of the data processing man?" Are we going to follow the business pattern which finds the data processing man as vice president because he handles so much of the data that the rest of us can't get along without him? I don't think we've answered that. As a matter of fact, we've had trouble answering how we are going to account for data processing, much less administer it.

I would ask another question as we look down the line, "Are we, in fact, going to seek balance in our staff?" Have you looked at your split between men and women on your staff these days? Do you think it is a humorous question about how few women you have on your staff? It is not going to be. I think it came home to me most pointedly this year at a faculty meeting when I looked out and saw all the male faces. Are you, in fact, going to seek a balance of men and women? Are you going to seek an ethnic mix? And, if you are going to go out of your way to achieve an ethnic mix, what are going to be your sources? Maybe we haven't shared our information with each other--that is, where are you going to seek qualified Black candidates, for example? As we look ahead to what balance in staffing is going to do to our fiscal demands, I think we need to look at the breakdown of age brackets. It is entirely possible that if we are going the road now of seeking only the bright young men, we could wind up 20 years from now with a very expensive, over-age, in-grade staff.

Perhaps we have to talk about balance and experience now. Further, what is going to be the mix between full-time faculty and part-time faculty? Have you so many part-timers now that you are beginning to wonder whether you have any continuity between your day and evening programs? Finally, in the area of administration and organization, what is going to be the effect of collective bargaining on all of these questions? Will we, in fact, be free to establish any of these policies?

In the vocational-technical area, I am not sure that it would be true of all of us in the junior colleges that we have done a very recent update of occupational surveys. I think we have to answer a rather basic question about vocational-technical training in this area. Are we going to continue to say we will look only at our district to see what its employment needs are, or are we going to train students and send them wherever they go?

In teaching approach, class size and load are, I suppose, the greatest concerns of most of us in the area of negotiating presently. If I could single out an area that would have more effect on needs than any other, it would certainly be class size and load. Do we know right now in our own schools what output we are expecting from each teacher? If somebody asks me, "Will you need as many teachers in certain areas if instructional technologies change?", I would say I don't know. But we ought to be asking that of our instructional deans.

How about para-professionals? Are we coming to the point where we are using para-professionals to assist us in the instructional task? If so, how many are we going to use and what effect is that going to have upon our teacher demands?

I have asked a number of questions. I will be quick on the others. In ancillary services in student personnel, are you going to go to counseling programs or are you going to use faculty advisement? Those of us who are in new community colleges perhaps haven't faced quite yet whether we are going to provide honest-to-goodness placement services in student personnel. If we are, somebody is going to have to man that desk. Are we doing as much individual testing as we might with our students? Probably not.

In library, how do you know how many staff people you are going to need unless you have a long-range plan for what your collection is going to be like and whether it is going to be print or non-print. Again, we are going to need para-professionals in library services.

Community service people would be pleased, I think, to have the question asked, "Are we going to stay on the kick of 'speakers, lecturers, concerts and use our buildings' as a definition of community service?" If we are not, if we are saying in a broader way we are agents of change in a community and we are going to do more than lectures and concerts, then this may have an implication for the kinds of people we bring to our staff.

The area of supply and demand, which I suppose you expected these comments to be about, is a deep concern of our university friends. It seems to me that we have a lot of homework to do at home before we can give good answers. A starter would be an analysis of this year's

vacancies and the applicants we have had. We say, "Well, everybody knows there are too many history teachers." There are worse generalizations than that being made. I had 2000 applicants for 30 jobs, but I still have areas that aren't covered, and many of those 2000 are not qualified applicants, in my judgment.

It is easy to drop a load of questions on your friends. I know what I am going to do. I'm going home to ask these questions of my staff. It would be helpful to know that others are pursuing them too. It would be great if a model were devised. I have reasonable intelligence and some background in institutional research and a desk and a calculator, but that's not enough. We must either do this model-making ourselves (I don't think we have the time nor the expertise) or we should ask people who are in the business of making models for planning to help us and then we could give them plenty of input.

I would say then as we meet with our university friends, "Yes, we should talk about our needs." The experience we had here last spring working with the staff in history was excellent; but, as the junior college people go home, it seems to me that we need to gather a great deal more information about where we are heading farther down the line than next year.

THE DIMENSIONS OF NEED FOR STAFFING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES DURING THE SEVENTIES

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

You are familiar with the growth patterns of the junior colleges (now more and more often called legally and sometimes affectionately the community colleges). These institutions are rapidly approaching the place where they represent over one-third of the total number of institutions of higher education in this country and are currently enrolling, in a few of the states, a majority of the undergraduate students. I believe that in about six states there are more undergraduates enrolled in the community colleges than in the combined enrollment of all the other institutions of higher education in those states. These community colleges, as a result of this, have suddenly become a highly desirable place to teach.

A few years ago, the less endowed graduates of master's and doctoral programs were encouraged to teach in junior colleges. Now it is becoming more common for most capable graduates to seek teaching jobs in junior colleges.

Current limitations which have been placed upon the continued expansions of many colleges and most of the universities in our country have changed the job picture which, just a few years ago, was one of faculty shortages into what currently appears to be a surplus of available faculty. I'm sure we're all familiar with instances where there have been as many as several hundred applicants for ten positions. Many presidents and deans report they have had little or no difficulty in finding individuals to fill available vacancies in almost all disciplines; even such areas as physics and math which experienced great scarcity as recently as two years ago now have many available applicants.

Since there are now more than 1100 junior colleges in the 50 states as compared with 2800 total institutions in higher education, one can easily understand the changes which are occurring in the employment opportunities for faculty in higher education. The portion of the total who are teaching in junior colleges is increasing each year, and now about one-fifth of the total higher education faculty teach in the two-year institutions and 90 percent of this number are teaching in public junior colleges.

How many people does this involve at the present time? Our management data is pretty slim; the accuracy is pretty questionable. But, there have been several recent studies which provide some help in drawing conclusions about the problems of employment of faculty members.

The NEA, as you know, conducts a study of faculty about every biennium, and their most recent survey of salaries, which reported the 1969-70 salaries, indicated that there were 41,000 full-time faculty in junior colleges in the country (1). The study projected this for the total number of junior colleges, since some people didn't answer their questionnaires, and estimated that there were 63,000 full-time faculty in the community colleges of the nation for that year (1969-

70). The NEA, then compared this with a projected total of 271,000 faculty members in the four-year colleges and universities. That is: 63,000 as compared with 271,000. This is about one-fifth of the total faculty. The American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), on the other hand. reported that there were 97,000 faculty members in all junior colleges in 1968-69 (one year earlier)(2). These differences between the two basic statistical studies might be explained by the fact that the AAJC figure represents a larger total number of institutions than the NEA figure. Secondly, the NEA figures reportedly represent full-time faculty while the AAJC report includes all of the faculty and was not reduced to a full-time equivalency figure. If, on the other hand, we use the same ratio to faculty as we would apply to students--that is, the number of students enrolled compared to the full-time equivalency--this would run around 60 percent in most institutions and would be a fairly close ratio in reference to faculty if we said there were 63,000 full-time equivalency faculty out of 97,000 total faculty. I am not sure how accurate these analogies may be.

In any case, we might project, if we wanted to use these figures, that we would have and have been having an increase in junior college enrollment of about 10-12 percent per year. This is nationwide. The NEA study shows that there was a 17 percent increase in faculty between 1967-68 and 1968-69. This would seem to indicate that there are currently about 110,000 total community college faculty members of which about 70,000 are full-time equivalents. The continued overall increase in student enrollments which may be expected in the next few years (at least until 1980) will average about 10 percent per year. This means an annual need for 7,000 new faculty members to take care of the expansion of the junior college program and 3,000 to take care of replacements--a grand total of 10,000 new faculty members each year for each of the next few years for the nation's community colleges.

This sort of macro planning is not, of course, applicable in every instance, not even to a state and certainly not to an individual institution. Illinois is one of the states that has been continually growing and presents some interesting data in this regard. For example, the AAJC reports Illinois added 1,000 new faculty between 1968-69 and 1970-71. Your own master plan, however, predicts that 375 new faculty would be needed between 1968-71. I don't know what happened here--the AAJC has 1,000 and your master plan predicted 375. If the master plan is conservative, then it is very conservative. These faculty were reported to have served an enrollment, in the AAJC figures, of 102,000 students in 1968 and 146,000 in 1970. Now, if you add 1,000 faculty members between these two dates, the increase in number of students represents a greater proportional increase than in the number of faculty and demonstrates an increase in student-faculty ratio of about four students per faculty.

I had occasion the other day to check up on enrollments and faculty projections for Florida. We have projected for this current year in Florida 225,000 students total enrollment during the year and actually we had 258,000 students enrolled. So, we had an increase of about 25,000 over the projection that had been made. We had projected 5,800 faculty to take care of this number, and we actually had employed only 5,100 faculty--a difference of about 700. So, in some of our projections five or six years ago, we had

projected a need for a greater number of faculty than we actually had employed and this has occurred simply by increasing the student-faculty ratio. Instead of increasing the number of faculty, we increased the number of students per faculty.

There is some difference in the rank order of states in terms of student enrollment and number of faculty employed. For example, Illinois is third in total enrollment this year and fourth in the number of faculty. You are exceeded in the number of faculty by Texas, which is third in the number of faculty employed and sixth in the number of student enrollments. This may be caused by the fact that there are some very small community colleges in Texas; or it may be that they are utilizing their faculty in a poor way; or it may be that yours are overloaded; or it may be that there are a larger number of part-time faculty in some institutions than there are in others, which would raise the total number of faculty employed but not the ratio.

Whatever the reason, we might expect, currently, that the best employment possibilities for new faculty would be in California, New York, Illinois, Florida, Michigan, Texas, Washington, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Oregon. Added to these states which currently employ 65,000 junior college faculty members are several states where community colleges are developing rather rapidly. These include such states as Wyoming, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama and Nevada, to name a few. While the numbers in these latter states are not very large, there are plans well underway to establish a number of new institutions as well as to enlarge existing ones. So, if I were in the university advising students where to look for jobs at the current time, these are the states where I would suggest they begin.

All of this illustrates one very important factor: that our present management information systems (the present ways in which we collect data) are so inadequate that, if you are going to do any planning, you are liable to get accuracy only by guess and by gosh or by mutually conflicting errors.

We see a great deal in current literature about how we are really providing too much higher education in this country right now. Let us look for a minute and see what we might expect in terms of growth patterns for the community colleges in the next few years. Some of the things that are happening in the "cut backs" in higher education are merely going to increase the responsibilities of the community colleges. They have already experienced this to a pretty sharp extent in California where the state universities have remained static or cut back and students poured into the junior colleges. This is what is likely to happen in many other states when the so-called "lid" is put on university and four-year college expansion.

We have just completed at the Institute for Higher Education a study on estimating the target population of community colleges for 1980. This is a macro-projection, of course, and it involves the philosophical goals of the community college. We have in the community colleges actually undertaken the formidable task of attempting to provide for most of the post-high school educational needs of all persons who may benefit from educational opportunity. This is a goal which is repeatedly stated in most states in most institutions. This goal has been accepted in theory in many places, if not all places, but seldom has it really been accepted in fact. At the same time,

there have been specific steps taken toward encouraging as many students as possible to attend local community colleges because it is less expensive to the parents and at the same time less expensive to the state.

If you want to get an idea of how some of the leading political officers react to this, you may note the recent message from the Governor of Ohio, who suggested that people repay the cost of their education if they went to a four-year college but that they would be excused from this repayment if they went to a community college. This is a direct and specific way to try to get people to attend junior college for the first two years.

Who are these people who attend community colleges? What are their educational needs? If we are going to prepare faculty for them, we are first going to have to look at the students. One college has described its typical student as follows (from a newspaper clipping):

> About the time they reach the first year of college young people begin asking seriously, "Who am I?"
>
> The Sante Fe Junior College composite student would get the following answer from a computer which read out characteristics of 1,954 students recently:
>
> You are between 17 and 21, predominately male (54 per cent) and predominately white (87 per cent). Your parents graduated from high school and they earn between $5,000 and $15,000 a year but you pay three-quarters of your college costs.
>
> The computer also reported that one-half the credit course students came directly to Santa Fe after graduation from high school and that a local high school leads in the number of alumni.
>
> One out of five Santa Fe students bombed out from the University of Florida and, in the case of transfer students, there is a 50-50 chance that he attended another junior college.
>
> Thirty-four per cent are attending SFJC because of its proximity (the computer doesn't say to what) and 12 per cent are there because it is inexpensive.
>
> The average Santa Fe student is concerned about his future goals and frequently seeks career information. However, when it comes to religion and sex, either he thinks he knows all the answers or he is not interested. Religious and sex education rate at the bottom of the list of requested services (less than 1 per cent).
>
> Four of every five students is in a transfer program leading to an upper division college or university. Their planned major is likely to be education (26 per cent); arts and sciences (23 per cent) with either psychology or business as majors.
>
> Nursing and engineering are also popular choices . . . .

I am sure if you would describe students in your institution on a composite basis, your description would come out very similar if not identical to that one. That merely illustrates that the composite, or median, or the student when we average all the extremes has no meaning to us because the community college is more an institution that serves a diversity than it is an institution that serves likeness. So, let's look at what this diversity involves.

1. We have a group of youth who have completed high school and who are preparing for transfer to a four-year degree program. A great number of our youth think they are this type of person. Not many of them actually are, but most of them think they are this kind of person.

2. We have youth who are merely continuing their general education without specific purpose. A lot more youth fall into that category than would be willing to admit it or whose parents would let them admit it.

3. We have youth who are preparing for defined occupations which require two years of training beyond high school. These are carefully defined occupations with very definite programs of instruction which are designed to provide that kind of training.

4. We have youth who are preparing for a job which requires skills they do not have upon entering the community college.

5. We have youth who must attend any of the above programs on a part-time basis while they work. As a matter of fact, working is a way of life for most community college students. At many institutions, 80 percent of the students hold down jobs varying from 4 or 5 hours a week to as high as 40 or 50 hours a week, even while they are attending full time.

6. We have youth whose unusual abilities have encouraged them to move through their formal education at a more rapid rate than is usual. A few of these are kids that haven't even completed high school, but have gone from the junior or sophomore level to the community college and have moved right on through.

7. There are adults (beyond the usual college age) who have personal objectives for completing associate degrees, baccalaureate degrees, or graduate degrees. These are people who have long since given up the idea of continuing education.

8. There are adults who require mid-career vocational retraining.

9. There are adults who want or must change their occupations.

10. There are adults who need further education than that previously completed for personal, economic, social or other reasons. Quite often, these might be people who have no particular responsibilities or interests in life when all of a sudden they are left on their own. I think

particularly of some of our ladies who have lost their husbands and whose children are scattered around the country. As a result, they have nothing to do.

11. We have adults who need refreshment or reemphasis upon the quality of living. Here again, people who have retired from other kinds of activity, who are living on small incomes, who have no aptitude for any continued job, and they need to have something to make them know that the world needs them and they need the world.

These are the kind of people that the community college is able to serve. These are not just institutions that serve the youth. This is the reason that before we can talk about teachers, we have to talk a little about what kind of teachers we are going to prepare to work with these people. These are a lot of different categories, and you might name some more from your own institution.

In our study, we looked at the ratio of these people to the total population in the 15 areas that served as our exemplary institutions. These were in seven states, and some states have developed an extensive junior college program and others haven't gone quite so far. The ratio of these eleven different groups of students constituting the total enrollment of the community college, when compared with the total population figure, ranged from a low of 3 persons per 1000 total population up to 45 persons per 1000 which were served by the community colleges in the year we were looking at. The mean for these colleges was 21 students per 1000, with a median of 17 per 1000.

A similar comparison may be found in the 1971 Junior College Directory. This comparison points out that the range in various states which it compared ranged from 0.6 per 1000 up to 35.9 per 1000 (California figure). Five states have already exceeded the 21 per 1000 of the exemplary institutions in our study, and 12 states exceeded the median of 17 per 1000.

All of these figures point to an expected continuation of increase in community college student enrollment. Using the 1980 population estimates prepared by the Bureau of Census and applying the ratio of 20 students per 1000, one would expect 4,500,000 students in 1980 to be enrolled in community colleges--4,500,000 students compared with 2,500,000 at the current time. On the other hand, if we use the top ratio which a few junior colleges have reached (50 per 1000), we could expect 12,000,000 students to be enrolled in junior colleges in the United States in 1980.

The current faculty ratio of one faculty member per 24 students would require an additional 40,000 new faculty within the next nine years plus an additional 16,000 for replacements. This would be needed for the estimated junior college enrollment of 4,500,000. If we went with the higher estimate, we would need 400,000 new faculty and 160,000 replacements or over 560,000 new faculty members for 12,000,000 students.

Actually, one might expect the actual fact to eventuate at a place somewhere between the 4.5 million and the 12 million enrollment and between the need for 56,000 faculty and 560,000 faculty described above. The most current predictors point out that there is a great likelihood that many institutions of higher learning will remain

static in size or even decrease somewhat in some instances. These predictions assume that current disenchantment regarding post-high school education on the part of some students and legislators will result in less emphasis on higher education. Countering this prediction, however, are the multitude of facts which caused the surging increases of higher education in the 1960's. Most of these are societal influences, and they are still very present and very active. Personal ambition for one's earning power has not changed for most people nor has the faith in education as a determinant in such earning power decreased perceptibly.

There will most likely, however, be changes in what individuals want from education. There will undoubtedly, I believe, be less emphasis upon college credit and considerably less emphasis upon the false emphasis upon grading. There will probably be less emphasis upon formal degrees than we have had in the most recent past; or at least we will change the requirements for obtaining the degrees in such a way that the so-called "open universities" will become more generally acceptable than they are at the present time. There will be some alleviation of certification based upon degrees for many kinds of jobs which we hold in society. I think, especially, there will be less emphasis upon continued and unbroken formal education.

These reactions will serve to increase the influence and the importance of the community colleges. They will result in more, not less, responsibility for the community colleges.

Some of the factors which will influence community college growth have already been mentioned. I will reiterate them:

1. Geographic accessibility

2. Limitations caused by space--facilities, parking

3. Inadequate financial support

4. Program accessibility

The extent to which these institutions may grow is going to be determined entirely and completely by the kind of support we get for them from the people who are supporting them. If we depend entirely upon increased fees, this is going to decrease the number of people who can go. These factors are important not only in determining the number of faculty which will be needed but will also be influential in determining the kind of faculty which will be needed. For example, if geographic accessibility is made a universal principle in all of our states, we will need faculty who can teach in an institution that has a wide variety and diversity of student body. If we make junior colleges geographically accessible and at the same time cut down or eliminate freshman and sophomore work at the university, we are going to affect the number of people coming to the community colleges and, thereby, affect the kind of faculty we need at these institutions.

If, in using our facilities more intensively, we get around-the-clock education and we have already done this in some places, we will need more faculty members and we will need faculty members who are willing to teach at all hours of the day and night. If we extend our facilities by renting and using other kinds of facilities on a temporary basis, this will increase the number of faculty we will be able to use even though we do not have more facilities.

The type of financial support we get will influence the number of faculty we have and the kind of faculty we have. The program balance will be affected by these other factors and also will affect the kinds of faculty we need. Who is going to determine when no one else can be admitted through the door? Who is going to determine what kinds of programs we are going to have? We keep hearing that we need to cut more people out of college, that we have too many people going to college, so we are going to send them to vocational schools. Most of the people who make this statement seem to have no idea what the cost of vocational education is.

The study we just completed on cost differentials indicates that there is no vocational education program in any junior college that costs less than the academic program, except business education. Business education costs 99 cents, where arts and science, without much science, costs $1.00. If you put a little science with it, it costs $1.10. If you teach nursing, it costs $1.67; if you teach sheet metal working, it costs $3.13. The more people we put into vocational education, the more education is going to cost. I think that we really ought to have more people in vocational education because it is not realistic to start 100 people in junior college with 70 of them indicating a goal of continuing at a four-year institution which only 30 of them do. The other 40 should have something better than we give them, but we will need more, not less, money to do it with.

Finally, a note about teaching strategies. The kinds and number of teachers we have is going to be largely dependent upon how we teach. We have not done a whole lot to improve our teaching, but we are going to have to. We are going to have to learn how to use grouping more effectively, we are going to have to use programmed learning, discussions, all kinds of ways of doing a better job of the job we have been assigned to do.

In summary, the dimensions of community college faculty during the 1970's are influenced by the following four factors:

1. The number of faculty we have currently available. This is going to be influenced by the number teaching full time and the number teaching part time.

2. Target population of community colleges.

3. The direct influence of the factors mentioned that control our growth; that is, financial support, facilities available, types of programs offered.

4. The demands made upon the faculty in terms of improving teaching and becoming more effective.

REFERENCES

(1) Research Division, NEA. Salaries in Higher Education, 1969-70. Higher Ed. Series, Research Report 1970-R6. Wash., D.C.: NEA, 1970.

(2) Harper, Wm. A. (editor). 1970 Junior College Directory. Wash., D.C.: AAJC, 1970.

DISCUSSION

A discussion period followed the presentation. A complete transcript of the questions and answers is not available. The following are excerpts taken from the tape recorder covering the general questioning period.

Question: Should faculty be alienated from participating in the advising of students?

Answer: You should have professional counselors, but that doesn't mean that the faculty doesn't participate. Professional counselors can't possibly do all the counseling. I think there is a professional ability, a professional knowledge, a professional competency in counseling that most faculty members don't have and one of the jobs that professional counselors do is help faculty understand what their job is. You can't divorce counseling from faculty activities.

Question: To what extent is modeling being done to help with the management information systems in the junior colleges throughout the country?

Answer: I think a lot of people talk about it but not very many people do much about it. There has been specifically in WICHE, with sizable grants, an attempt to develop management information base dictionaries and using these as bases for institutional development modeling. The University of Toronto has developed a model for management data information for universities called "CAMPUS" and two or three others have tried to develop a model which is usable for themselves. I don't know of any overall model that is useful in institutions at this stage of the game, and the biggest problem is collecting information.

Mr. Smith: May I just do a little follow-up to your comments. In our series of seminars, the next one on June 17-18 will bring the WICHE people into the seminar. I might say that, with regard to junior college modeling, WICHE at the present time is trying to develop a model--a take-off from the one they started on senior institutions--which they hope to unveil in its initial stages in October or November. As far as WICHE is concerned, a part of their work at the seminar in Illinois in June is going to include field testing on the model they are trying to develop.

Question: We are in the process of taking bids for site development for a campus of 2400 students (full-time day equivalencies). We are developing right now about 50 acres of parking, access roads, walks, etc. In connection with the tremendous growth in enrollment that you predict for the 1970's, what effect is this going to have on our site development? If we are developing 50 acres now for 2400 and we are talking about an increase of four times the number of students we have on campus now, what is this going to do as far as the development of sites is concerned? Are we going to go to multi-level structures, are we going to have underground garages?

Answer: No, we are not going to put them all on one campus. We are going to scatter them out all over the place. A lot of the students we are going to have aren't what we ordinarily think of as students at

the moment. These figures of predictions of enrollment are not the 18, 19, 20 and 21 year olds.

Question: But, are they going to be driving cars to the campus?

Answer: You are not going to teach them on the campus. You are going to teach them in rented buildings, store fronts, hurches, wherever you can find space. There just isn't going to be enough money to build that many buildings on one campus. It isn't possible, and I'm not sure if it's even feasible. We have a choice here--we must do a good job of educating or we must let somebody else do it.

Question: We are using store fronts and rented buildings and I approve of this to a degree, but do you know the junior colleges are right in the center of the four-year institutions, all of which as far as I know at the present time, have pretty nice campuses, and all the secondary schools who feed us have quite nice structures. What is this going to do to the image of the junior colleges forever?

Answer: I don't think the image of junior colleges is going to be dependent on buildings. It is going to be dependent upon the quality of services rendered. I'm not saying that we are not going to have campuses and we are not going to have buildings. We are going to have buildings, but perhaps one-third or one-half of our student body will be served in those places and the rest will be served in other places. Unless we refuse to do the job, in which case society will go to other institutions who will do the job. Either we accept the job of educating as our responsibility or somebody else will.

Question: Would you discuss unique types of preparation for college teachers?

Answer: Let me delay in terms of what I have notes to talk about this morning.

STAFFING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES: WHO, WHERE, WHY, AND HOW

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

I guess if I had one specific limited objective in what I talked about last night, it was to illustrate that no one really can accurately predict at the present moment how many faculty members we are going to need in the next ten years. We really are not quite sure at the moment, in terms of good management data, what we have at the present time nor are we sure what we are going to need in the future in terms of how many faculty members will be needed in each of the various subject areas or how many faculty members we are going to need in relation to the number of students we are going to have. We really aren't quite sure how much of the burden of education at the post-high school level will be shifted to the community college and how much will be shared with other kinds of institutions.

Today, I wanted to move more into the problem of staffing the junior college and to talk about characteristics that are presently existing in junior college faculty members. We can use some of this background in projecting additional input into what we will need in the future. I noted in Newsweek last week a description from the 1970 census of Mr. Average American. The Bureau of Census describes Mr. American as someone who is 45.6 years old and has spent 12.2 years of those in school. There are 3.62 persons in his family, including 2.34 children, and his income is $10,577. This is an interesting description of Mr. Average American because the typical community college faculty member, with a few exceptions, is not too different from this Mr. Average American. The typical community college faculty member is male, 41 years old, and has a salary of $9,250 for 10 months. (If you added summer salary, this would bring it up another 20-30 percent depending on what state he is in.) He has a master's degree, a wife who also attended college, and has two children. He has taught three years or less in a community college and came there either from a high school position or from a four-year college position. He is well satisfied with the community in which he lives and participates with reasonable regularity in some church and/or civic activities. He reports that he spends at least 45 hours per week on his work which includes teaching classes, advising 10 or more students and occasionally chaperoning a student extra-curricular activity. He says his morale is high and he enjoys teaching. He thinks he understands the functions of a community college but is not certain that there may not be too much emphasis on areas outside his own discipline and interests. He is a changing typical person, however.

A recent study (1968) by Mills (1) in Florida compared Florida faculty members with a similar analysis carried out by Montgomery (2) in 1962. There is a six-year span between these two studies. There are a number of changes which were described in the Florida faculty, and I will mention only a few which seem pertinent to our discussion today. For example, Mills found that there were more faculty members who were officially designated as counselors in 1968 than in 1962. In other words, a definite trend toward designating this as a specific type of responsibility. Secondly, the average age increased. There

were a few more male faculty members in 1968 than there had been in 1962. There were an increasing number who came from military service backgrounds in 1968. There were more married faculty in 1968 and they had more children. There was a perceptible drop in participation in church activities between 1968 and 1962, and an equal decrease in membership in civic organizations and state educational organizations. There was, on the other hand, an increase in the percentage of faculty joining discipline oriented organizations in 1968. There was evidence of more "provincialism" in the 1968 faculty than there was in the 1962 faculty in the fact that, in this particular study, a larger percentage had spent all their adult life in Florida. Fewer faculty in 1968, as compared with 1962, had received a college degree and fewer had received any specific preparation to teach in a junior college. In other words, there was an increase in the number teaching in the occupations who had not received college degrees. There were fewer faculty members in 1968 than in 1962 who had previous teaching experience.

In asking these faculty members for their opinions regarding various activities related to the junior college, the 1968 faculty indicated an increase in the following areas. More faculty members favored these things than had been true in 1962. More faculty members favored merit or incentive pay--a recognition of competence in the pay scale. More faculty members were aware of and favored the development of guided or developmental studies. More faculty members wanted to use the name community college rather than junior college. More faculty members were concerned about facilities and having lighter loads. There was a decrease in the number of faculty who looked with favor upon the following things:

1. in-service education programs
2. internal structure within the college
3. level of communication and other procedures for carrying on college activities

Overall, there seemed to be identifiable and consistent improvement in both understanding and acceptance of philosophy which has guided community college development during this century. But, at the same time, there was considerably less trust expressed in the college administration and its structure within the institution.

Typically, these faculty members were becoming more and more like what they had commonly assumed to be a typical university type behavior. The question that might occur to us at this point is have we created in the community college "little" university people rather than a new type of teacher which we called for. Although, typically, these faculty members have come from several sources, most of them have come from graduate schools and positions in other colleges. The heavy dependence upon secondary schools as a source of faculty members has decreased. In some parts of the country, they had begun to move over from the local high schools into the community colleges; but, more recently, the colleges have moved away from that source. In fact, several studies in the past have reported that from 20-30 percent of junior college faculty members have previously taught in high schools. A recent study in Illinois, however, shows a decrease from 30 percent of new faculty members coming from high schools in 1969 to 19 percent in 1970. The same study also showed an increase in the number of faculty coming from business and industry.

A number of studies have described the competencies which are required for teaching in a community college. Blocker (3) noted that the potentially successful junior college teacher should have a master's degree and extensive experience in secondary or higher education. Gleazer (4) stated that we must revise master's degree programs offered by universities to include extensive seminar work. In addition, he indicated that the opportunity for an internship in the junior college should be provided. Roger Garrison, who did a very extensive study of junior college faculty for about a year and a half under a grant out of the office of AAJC, listed some ten areas which he concluded were indicators of the effectiveness of community college faculty members (5). They are:

1. You have to look at the nature and extent of the faculty member's effectiveness and activity in committee or other faculty work.

2. His role in the initiation of student activities.

3. Publications, books, speeches, articles and monographs by the faculty member.

4. The extent of his responsibilities as a student adviser.

5. His ability to create and use teaching aids.

6. Innovations and experiments which the faculty member uses in his own teaching.

7. Repeat of grants for experimentation of further study by the faculty member.

8. Extent of the faculty member's participation in appropriate professional organizations.

9. His activity as an active citizen in the community.

10. What he does out of school time that is related to his professional growth.

Gordon and Whitfield (6) saw the needs of a potentially successful teacher as a command of techniques and media, an ability to communicate effectively, and an ability to deal with a wide range of learning problems. Unruh (7) further pointed out that the need for special training for junior college faculty members included the following programs:

1. A broad general education.

2. At least a master's degree and one additional year without high specialization.

3. Development of competence in dealing with students.

4. Work experience in a junior college.

The American Council on Education (8) published a list of seven specific recommendations for the basic programs of preparation and experience of faculty members in the community colleges. These seven are as follows:

1. A clear conception of philosophy and background of these institutions, their relationship to the total educational structure and especially their place in the community.

2. An understanding of human growth and development of special problems of the age groups enrolled in these institutions.

3. Adequate skill in curriculum construction and evaluation of other areas related to the arts and science construction in these institutions.

4. An adequate supervised teaching experience lasting at least a quarter or a semester in the type of teaching in which they are planning to engage. This experience should include participation in various kinds of non-classroom supervised activities such as counseling and committee work. Whenever possible, it should include a part-time internship or part-time position under appropriate direction.

5. A clearly balanced appreciation of both occupational and general educational services of the institution.

6. Especially for those faculty members who are teaching in the occupational areas, an occupational competence which includes practical on-the-job experience with due recognition of this practical experience.

7. For instructors in the field of general or academic education, competence in their special fields and also a broad functional field, for example, such as social factors in the life of the community as well as in history and social sciences, or in the humanities, or in health and community, or in conservation of human resources in the community with practical experience in community service agencies, such as newspapers, camps, and similar types of activity.

It may be observed through all this that there is an agreement that the junior college faculty member needs a preparation of a variety of highly specialized skills. The problem exists in finding teachers who are specifically prepared for the junior college task. These competencies have been described by many different writers both within the community colleges and the universities. Until recently, only a few people admitted that the ability to be an effective teacher required more than the usual academic study. Now, even the most subject oriented college teachers will (perhaps begrudgingly) recognize that there is, or at least may be, some possibility to improve his own teaching. I suspect that the most important thing that has occurred in higher education in the last three or four years has been the general acceptance of student evaluations of faculty. When this occurs, faculty members begin to have a little less confidence in their ability to teach. I know it has happened so thoroughly on our campus that, for the first time to my knowledge in the history of the

university, there have been faculty members in several of the colleges on campus who have come to us and have asked what we could do to help them improve their teaching. The university has now a new program for working with graduate assistants in improving their teaching skills and, through this process, we have slipped in a little help for some of their directing department people. It has been a very healthy experience.

The primary factor which has influenced this current recognition is the student himself, as I said. What does he want for a teacher? One of the most important statements in this respect to what students want is a little book put out by the Hazen Foundation called The Student in Higher Education written in 1968 (9). In this particular book, there are a few quotes which I would like to call to your attention. They have been talking in this book about the need for faculty attention to improving the education of the young people coming into the institution. There is a section called "Upgrading the Faculty." I thought you might enjoy hearing what these people said about the need for upgrading the faculty.

> The process of upgrading the faculty is quite involved. It begins by attracting more distinguished faculty members. Distinguished faculty members are those whom members of their discipline say are distinguished. Their distinction is measured by how many publications they have produced (at times no matter how trivial or irrelevant or how inappropriate frequent publication is in a particular discipline), by the reputation of the graduate school they attended (which, in turn, depends upon how distinguished its faculty was), and by the ardency with which they subscribe to the current professional orthodoxies or, even better, the approved unorthodoxies. Finally, after all these requirements are met, a faculty member still is not really considered distinguished unless he is known by people who already have distinguished reputations and he also knows a sufficient number of other distinguished people.
>
> How does a school go about collecting these prestigious faculty members, especially at a time when there are far more positions available for such men than there are candidates to fill them? [Even with our current "oversupply" of doctoral degress, there still are very few distinguished positions and very few distinguished faculty members to fill these positions.] There are three sure ways: First of all, the distinguished academician must be promised a high salary, a large number of fringe benefits, and an almost unlimited opportunity for other kinds of employment which will increase his annual income even more. Second, he must be promised a light teaching load. In fact the more distinguished he is, the lighter his teaching load must be, so it is quite possible that the most distinguished faculty members will be hired to teach absolutely nothing at all. Third, he must be promised that most, if not all, of the time he does spend in the classroom will be with graduate students. There are several unique advantages of teaching graduate students when compared with undergraduates, the most important of which is that the docile graduate student is more likely to work <u>for you</u>, whereas the pesty undergraduate is more likely to demand that you work <u>for him</u>. When such a renowned

> academician has received his high salary, his light teaching load, and his coterie of promising graduate students, he can proceed with enthusiasm and vigor to do more research and to develop an even bigger reputation than he has, and thus improve the reputation of the faculty on which he is serving until the day comes when another institution offers him more attractive working conditions (9).

Now, the difficulty is not that this is true, because it is true and it has pertinence and validity within the context in which it should be placed. The trouble is that we measure the whole system on this basis rather than on other factors which are more important for other parts of the institution.

I spent last Friday and Saturday with a committee of alumni that the President of the University of Florida appointed as a part of our self-study program. The alumni were concerned about how they might increase the acceptance and prestige of the University of Florida. We spent several hours talking about the Carrter Report published by the American Council on Education which rates departments in terms of being distinguished, average or above average, or average and below average. You know how these ratings are arrived at? Just like the Hazen Foundation report describes them. Nobody was concerned about improving undergraduate education. They were concerned about developing a distinguished university which is done on the basis of graduate ratings, rated by other distinguished people. There is a place for that; but, at the same time, I would want to recognize the fact that we are talking about preparing junior college faculty.

The committee goes on to say: (Now, keep in mind this group writing this report was not concerned about junior colleges but was concerned about undergraduate four-year college education.)

> A new kind of faculty member must appear, composed of men and women whose primary concern is the facilitation of the learning experiences of students and helping them derive personal meaning from these experiences. These faculty members will be competent in one or several academic disciplines, but their commitment will turn from the kind of professional research they can report in academic journals to the developmental experience of undergraduates. Given the expected surplus of Ph.D.'s in the early 1970's [remember, this was written in 1968], it should be relatively easy to find trained personnel who would be interested in such work. Indeed a good number of the current personalist generation of undergraduate and graduate students would undoubtedly find far more life satisfactions in this sort of work than in being academic researchers. The new faculty must be required to understand in practice the basic principles of human psychological development, and they must be committed to aiding the emotional development of their students. Nowhere in most, if not all, Ph.D. programs do we emphasize this and very few master's or even post-master's degrees for faculty members or even recognize the fact that there is a need to understand the basic principles of human psychological development. Their status in the university must be at least equal to that of faculty who are interested primarily in research, and this equal status must be reinforced by the only means

> that is effective in American society--equal, if not superior, pay.
>
> In addition, it would be extraordinarily helpful if some teachers were not from the academic community. No disrespect for the worldliness or sophistication of the college professor is meant by this recommendation, but students would benefit greatly from occasional and even frequent contact with instructors whose primary orientation is not academic. The world is made up of vast varieties of people, and despite the increase in the number of professional academicians, they are still but a small minority of the human race. For the college to facilitate the fullest growth of the human personality, it ought to reflect the world beyond the campus in every feasible way. Besides, the nonacademic sector of society might be greatly enriched if some of their members had more frequent contact with the college students and faculty (9).

Then the report goes on to recommend that the power of academic guilds over undergraduate instruction must be broken; that faculty veto groups, however powerful, can no longer be permitted to block reform in undergraduate education; and that most people "play" with the curriculum but very few people do much about it. This is an opinion, a position, taken by a group of people who were studying what we should be doing for the student in higher education.

I think that this report has some implications for us, though, as we talk about the question of community college faculty members. Maybe the emphasis which we have fallen into of trying to make community college faculty more nearly like their brothers in the university is the wrong direction.

McKeachie (10), at the University of Michigan, reports that teachers who demonstrated the following characteristics were more effective than those who did not demonstrate these skills. He did these over a resume of a series of research studies.

1. He said that teachers who were successful were able to present material in an interesting fashion.

2. These teachers were able to stimulate the intellectual curiosity of students.

3. These teachers were able to explain things clearly.

4. They were able to exhibit skill in observing student reactions.

5. They were able to listen attentively to what members of the class had to say.

6. They had a friendly manner.

7. They were characterized as being permissive and flexible in the classroom.

8. They explained the reason when they had criticism for students.

We really don't do very much in most pre-service education programs to develop these kinds of effective skills. We do a great deal in developing cognate skills. We do a fair amount in developing psychomotor skills, but the effective skills are ones which we think just happen and we give very little attention to trying to do anything specifically about them. Perhaps we don't even point up to beginning or potential teachers the importance of these kinds of effective qualities in a human being.

The community college presents a teacher preparation problem that is more like the problem of preparing secondary school teachers than the usual college faculty member. Because of the student characteristics discussed last night, because of the nature of the community college program, and because of the fact that there is a diversity of programs in the community college, there are at least six major areas of competence, it would appear to me, which require special attention in preparing community college teachers. These are different kinds of teachers in reality.

1. Those who will teach freshman and sophomore courses comparable to those taught in the four-year college. The people who teach these courses must understand and must be able to do this in a way that will give these students an experience that is comparable to the university.

2. Those who will teach in areas generally labeled general education and personal development. These may be the same people as (1), but I doubt it. One of the biggest difficulties we have had in the development of general education programs is that nowhere have we adequately developed faculty members to teach in those kinds of institutions.

3. Those who will work in learning resources laboratories to aid persons ranging from virtual illiteracy up to highly developed professional competence. We need specially trained and prepared faculty members who will work in learning resources laboratories.

4. Those who will teach a wide variety of occupational courses ranging from psycho-motor skills and competencies up to high degrees of technical knowledge and understanding.

5. Those who will work with adults in a variety of continuing education and similar programs or courses.

6. Those who have developed expertise in working with other faculty in improvement of instruction.

A great deal of attention has been given to pre-service preparation of faculty who will fall into category one. Programs are typical at most institutions at master's and post-master's level to prepare people to teach the regular academic freshman and sophomore courses. These programs usually include the following:

1. At least a minimum of 18 semester hours (27 quarter hours) in a discipline at the graduate level (sometimes called "substantial" work).

2. Some concern for understanding the philosophy and psychology of learning and some acquaintance with the community junior college itself. In fact, repeated studies have indicated that faculty members who are considered by junior college people to be most successful are those who have had at least one course or some direct experience with a course which deals specifically with the community college as a part of the total scheme of higher education.

3. A supervised teaching, internship or practical experience. These are three elements which are usually found in master's or post-master's programs that are designed for preparing junior college faculty to teach freshman and sophomore courses.

Several studies have been conducted in an attempt to devise programs which might be considered as more innovative in these three areas, but very little new or different has come from these studies.

Category four, which deals with preparing people for the occupational areas, represents quite a different problem. There is such a wide range of occupations. There is a wide range in the sophistication which is common to some occupations and not found in others. There is a difference in the working and teaching situations. All these make it very difficult to prescribe a pattern of pre-service education that would apply equally well to all occupational areas.

There are, it appears to me, about four major essentials which could be listed as necessary for pre-service preparation.

1. There needs to be some experience for that individual in the occupation which he is going to teach.

2. There should be some understanding of our total occupational structure and some understanding of the relationship of occupations to each other.

3. There needs to be some understanding of students themselves. Perhaps we might refer to this as a "common sense" knowledge of people.

4. They need to have some experience in acquiring teaching skills.

Those people in category three--those who will work with students in a learning resources laboratory--will require a deeper understanding of the teaching-learning process than people who work in a classroom. They are going to have to be able to draw more heavily on a wider variety of teaching strategies in working with individual students. They are going to have to have an ability to be innovative and devise strategies that apply for certain individuals but not for others. Perhaps they need to have, most of all, the deepest understanding of the psychology of learning. And, perhaps we know as little about how people learn as anything else in the whole teaching area.

Those in category two--those who teach in general education--need more understanding of the areas of learning and the inter-relationship of these areas because they are going to have to work out curriculum and experiences that help people meld and pull together the various disciplines that we have separated so completely.

Those in category five--those who are working with adults--are going to need some special skills in working with adults. They will need special understanding of group dynamics. They will need a better understanding of the needs of adults as opposed to the needs of young people. They would need, it would seem to me, more in the background of sociology, anthropology and political science than we ordinarily provide for most faculty members.

Those in category six--those who will become the catalysts for helping faculty improve on the job--are an entirely new breed of people. These are people who need to combine some of the understanding of working with new combinations of subject areas, and all the various types of things which have been commonly associated in our secondary schools with supervision, improvement of instruction and, in our colleges and universities, with the deans' jobs. This person must be a change agent and must learn to operate as a change agent. As a matter of fact, it would appear to me that the most important activity in faculty development in the community college is the in-service program. You will remember that the Florida faculty between 1968 and 1962 said that their approval and concern for the in-service program had gone down. I'm not sure if this is because the programs were inferior, or because they got tired of them, or because they really weren't doing very much, or maybe it was because the establishment was pushing the in-service programs and faculty members were reacting adversely because of that fact. But whatever the reason, it would seem to me that the most important thing that a junior college president and his faculty must do is to determine what is a satisfactory in-service program.

I will quote here again from Roger Garrison (11). In reference to faculty improvement, he said, "To have a college that is a learning place for teachers is the primary administrative responsibility." If the teachers in a college do not continue to learn, neither will students continue to learn. Most especially, at this point in the development of the community college movement, the teacher's needs, the problems he identifies as pressing require first priority and continued urgent attention from the administration, from the boards who allocate funds for the colleges, from legislatures, from his own immediate administrators and eventually from the public who pay the bills. In other words, when we begin to cut out activities because of limited funds, we better not cut out the in-service program or we are going to end up with a sterile institution.

In summary, let me review what I have said. The typical community college teacher in this important time has been bound by an inferior self-concept problem which has been engendered by the higher education establishment. He has been, as a result, attempting to emulate and imitate his university colleagues to the detriment of his own program. What we need is not more university people teaching in junior colleges but perhaps more community college people teaching in the freshman and sophomore years at the university. Community college people are no longer going to accept this image. It seems we are entering now a period of change. In order to change, however, the

university people who are responsible for the pre-service education of community college faculty members will need to recognize that we do have six different kinds of faculty members (perhaps you can think of others). But, at least we do have these six who need special attention in terms of preparation. That is those who will:

1. teach university parallel courses
2. teach general education courses
3. work in learning resources laboratories
4. teach a vast spectrum of occupational courses
5. work with adults
6. give their full-time attention to faculty in-service improvement

Each of these six areas require somewhat different attention on the part of the university and somewhat different pre-service programs.

Finally, the emphasis on continued in-service education would seem to me to be the most important activity that is assigned to the community colleges. The ways in which the university may help in this in-service continuation are exemplified in the sort of thing we are doing here--that is, meetings that the university can sponsor to bring people together to talk about their problems and begin to seek solutions to them. The continued emphasis that we see in all other areas of life is equally present here. Pre-service education is not enough for doing the job.

REFERENCES

(1) Kurth, Ed. L. and Eric R. Mills. Analysis of Degree of Faculty Satisfaction in Florida Community Junior Colleges. USOE Project No. 8-D-047. Univ. of Florida, 1968.

(2) Montgomery, Douglas M. "An Analysis of Faculty Acceptance of and Commitment to the Stated Mission of the Florida Community Junior College." Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1962.

(3) Blocker, Clyde E. "Are Our Faculties Competent?" Junior College Journal 36:12-17 (Dec. 1965/Jan. 1966), p. 15.

(4) Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Faculty Development Project." Junior College Journal 38:7 (April, 1968).

(5) Garrison, Roger. Teaching in a Junior College. Wash., D.C.: AAJC, 1968, p. 25.

(6) Gordon, Shirley B. and Raymond P. Whitfield. "A Formula for Teacher Preparation." Junior College Journal 37:26-28 (May, 1967).

(7) Unruh, Adolph. "The Special Training Needed for Teachers in Junior Colleges or Community Colleges." Education 71:139-142 (Nov. 1950).

(8) ACE. Wanted: 30,000 Instructors for Community Colleges. Wash., D.C.: The Council, 1949, pp. 12-13.

(9) Committee. The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, 1968.

(10) McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching Tips. A Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Co., 1969.

(11) Garrison, Roger H. "Effective Administration for Superior Teaching." Junior College Journal 32:517-525 (May, 1962).

DISCUSSION

A discussion period followed the presentation. A complete transcript of the questions and answers is not available. The following are excerpts taken from the tape recorder covering the general questioning period.

Question: Would you comment briefly on some of the things that we might see occurring in the classroom in the junior colleges with regard to techniques, methods and innovative approaches?

Answer: Of course, talking about these is more difficult than looking at them. It would seem to me that we are going to have to learn some of the things that our colleagues in medicine have learned and that is, to develop a "bag" of strategies and adapt these to individual students and individual groups of students. I am sure you are all aware that if you have two groups of 30 people that you have two entirely different groups of people. A good faculty member is one who can sense this and judge this and make decisions about what kind of techniques to use. I think we will use more individually directed learning in the future than we have in the past. We should use more completely and more adequately some of the current devices we have other than writing, hearing and reading. We know that some things are learned much better by seeing. We also know that bringing sound and visual activity together in certain combinations creates an increase in learning. We really have a good deal of research on good ways of teaching and learning that we haven't used very well. I don't know how many of you have seen the book McKeachie put out on improving college teaching. It is a rather simplistic book; but, if most of our college people would use just that, we would have better teachers. I don't know how else to answer the question on teaching strategies except to say that accompanying teaching strategy are several other things which I think are important in improving teaching such as the grading system. The non-punitive grading is making great headway in higher education all over the country. We have seen institutions like Brown in Rhode Island and Stanford in California (some of the really highly respected universities) move into a non-punitive grading system, although this strikes many registrars and faculty members as being dishonest and immoral.

Question: Could you expand upon your advice on how we can do a good job of working with the junior colleges on in-service education?

Answer: I think the primary job of the university is pre-service preparation. I think the university can participate in in-service improvement only to the extent in which the community colleges ask and want them to. You can't do it for them, so I guess you have to start with advisory committees and groups of junior college faculty members and/or administrators to find out what is going to be useful to them. One of the most useful programs that our institute has developed in Florida has been the recent emphasis on systems approach to learning. My answer then is that you really can't do it until they come in and want you to do it. In the meantime, you can spark interest by an occasional speech or other activity.

Question: Would you discuss briefly the various kinds of college calendars?

Answer: Most research I am familiar with on college calendars indicates it doesn't make much difference what you do to it. This is not really the important thing. There has been of recent date something called 2-1-2 where you have one long semester, then a short semester in the wintertime, and then another longer semester. We did a rather extensive study about five or six years ago. We had a task force that spent a year looking at various types of calendars for junior colleges. We came to the conclusion, as a result of this study, that there really is not anything better than what we have been using--that is, two regular semesters with an extended summer session--except for one major change which is, that the first semester should end at Christmas and not be extended over the Christmas holidays. This is what we did. We switched back so that the fall semester starts the first of September and is completed by Christmas; the second semester starts in January and runs through the end of May; and then an extended summer session takes care of the rest of the year. This seems to work very well because high schools provide graduates in June. In other words, if you are going to make much more change, you really have to go back and change the high school calendar. The universities, in the meantime, have gone on a quarter system.

I don't really think there is any magic in calendars. If you will observe the fall issue of the bulletin put out by the American Association of Registrars and Admissions Offices, usually on the first or second page they say, "the following colleges have moved from the quarter system to the semester system" and "the following colleges have moved from the semester system to the trimester system" and "the following colleges have moved from the trimester system to the quarter system." In other words, it seems that people are going around in circles. Most of the changes we have had recently in our state have occurred because somebody thinks there is a more efficient way to operate in terms of using money.

Question: Are we doing a student a disservice by urging him to go on beyond the master's degree to teach in the junior college?

Answer: My own personal conclusion is that the master's degree is insufficient preparation to do the kind of job I described. In spite of the fact that there seems to be a de-emphasis on higher education at the post-master's level, it would seem to me that this must either be done through the in-service training or through more formal pre-service activity. A master's degree is just not adequate to do any one of the six jobs I have described. You can do it, but you do it with a great deal of limitation.

UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS FOR THE 1970's

Richard R. Bond
Vice President and Dean of Faculties
Illinois State University

My discussion this afternoon is addressed simultaneously to those from the community colleges and to those from the university colleges who are partners in the higher education business of this State. I should like to begin by reviewing for those in the senior institutions some of the particular staffing needs of the community colleges, perhaps at the risk of stating the obvious to those from the community colleges. Only by so doing, however, can I be certain that we begin with a common base.

The discussions of this seminar have brought into sharp focus certain facts and needs regarding junior college staffing for the coming decade. They include:

1. The continued development of the community college as a comprehensive institution.

2. A projection of continuous staff needs.

3. A community college faculty primarily concerned with teaching.

4. A community college faculty with a wide range of teaching aptitudes, abilities, and interests.

The comprehensive nature of community college programs makes them strange animals to those whose background and home are in the universities. Baccalaureate-oriented programs and general education programs are standard fare with university faculty. Less familiar to them, but differing only in degree, are the developmental and/or remedial programs in which community colleges have shown exceptional leadership. Many university faculty, however, are simply strangers to the wide range of occupational and semi-technical programs which are standard for the community college doing the job its constituency demands. These occupational fields include such diverse items as agriculture, commerce, allied health fields, data processing, electronic and mechanical technologies, public-social service, trades and crafts, and others.

This variety poses both problems and opportunities to those who educate and those who recruit the faculties of community colleges. The transfer programs encompass virtually the full range of the liberal arts and sciences, the fine arts, applied science and business. The Illinois Public Junior College Act mandates that their standards in the transfer programs be similar to those adhered to in the public colleges and universities. Therefore, their staffs must include teachers with abilities equal to or greater than those assigned to lower division courses in the senior institutions, since most of these teachers will have in their classes students with a wider range of abilities and occupational goals than their counterparts in the four-year institutions.

Developmental or remedial programs serve substantial enrollments of young adults, who for a variety of reasons need work in written and speech communication and mathematics before attempting typical college work.

Vocational and technical programs may--and often do--require faculty who have had a type of practical experience significantly different from that of his fellow faculty members. In some instances, even the first college degree might be superfluous for such faculty members. In the interest of time, I shall not discuss today the role of the university in the staffing of these technical programs. There are some interesting suggestions in the BHE Panel report "The Preparation of Junior College Teachers" about the possibility of university-industry collaboration in this effort.

Except for some of the occupational fields, the minimal formal education for community college teachers includes a master's degree for the majority of the staff. According to recent statistics, a very significant proportion of the staff has pursued graduate studies beyond the master's, with about 5% possessing the doctorate.

There are currently five major sources for community college faculty recruitment:

1. other junior colleges
2. senior colleges and universities
3. secondary schools
4. business and industry
5. graduate schools

In 1970, about 18% of the new community college staff came from senior institutions, about 13% from other junior colleges, and, as we heard last night, only about 19% from secondary schools--a dramatic reduction from 30% the year before--and about 20% from business or industry. Increasingly, the junior colleges are turning to the graduate schools and to the faculty of other higher educational institutions for their staffs.

With these facts in mind, what is the university agenda for the 1970's?

For the teachers of the liberal arts courses, junior and senior institutions may be recruiting from the same or similar manpower pools, both at the master's and at the doctoral levels. It appears that the community colleges have crossed the bridge into higher education by not being forced into a certification program for their teachers. With the strictures upon the market both at the senior colleges, the secondary schools, and in junior colleges, a greater selectivity in employment will be possible.

As a minimum, an increasing number of master's degree candidates with teaching interests will be encouraged to consider community colleges as their potential field of entry. Their programs should, first of all, be substantial in preparation in their respective academic disciplines--the equivalent of that expected for instructors at the senior institutions. In addition, it seems to me that there would and should be a preference for those whose programs have oriented them toward teaching, have given them some understanding of

the specific problems faced by community college teachers and have included some supervised teaching experience.

Preparation beyond the master's level will create some substantial problems, exacerbated, it seems to me, by the shortsightedness of Phase III of the State Master Plan in not providing either a port of entry or an in-service goal intermediate between the master's and doctoral degrees. The Specialist degree in the disciplines is apparently being ruled out by the Master Plan, although the question is still somewhat open with the creation of a study commission. It seems to me, however, that for teachers of courses beyond the freshman level in the community colleges, those colleges would be justified in demanding additional work in an integrated program beyond the master's, with major emphasis upon subject matter preparation. The Master Plan does not speak directly to an alternative recommended by the Committee on the Preparation of Junior College Teachers and tried with some success at the University of Tennessee; namely, a two-year Master of Arts in College Teaching. I feel that an integrated post-master's program is preferable to a catch-as-catch can program. Some senior institutions should be working with the junior colleges in experimenting with some such programs which include both in-service activities on site and experiences on the senior college campuses. Perhaps this conference can help chart some such directions for I.S.U.

Primary emphasis, to repeat, should be in the discipline, but a closer correlation with the teaching experience itself should be incorporated into the program. In addition, there should be some specific work either in-service or pre-service into the nature of the community college and more broadly into the nature of higher education.

University staffs will be impelled to study more carefully the characteristics of junior colleges with regard to programs, students and specific problems in order to develop graduate programs that will attract junior college teachers to further graduate work. The traditional high horse mounted by the senior institutions must be broken to pay particular attention to the needs of this new segment of higher education. The tremendous range of students attending junior colleges and the unique local control both in program and financing needs to be understood by teachers entering there. A university program will become attractive as it addresses itself to these questions while simultaneously insisting upon strong academic preparation.

Programs addressing themselves to these twin goals, it seems to me, have to be longer than the single master's year, yet need not be at the doctoral level. If they are not, one or the other of the goals will be slighted. Universities who receive transfer students have a right to insist upon their adequate academic preparation by teachers who "know their stuff" and junior college districts have a right to expect <u>both</u> this and the understanding and experience necessary to make a <u>good</u> teacher committed to junior college work.

Doctoral level work for community college teachers is more controversial. It is feared by some junior college administrators both because of the budgetary implications and because their sad experience has been that doctorate holders have used the junior

college as a steppingstone. Careful attention by senior institutions to non-traditional doctoral programs with primary emphasis upon teaching, whose products include persons both sympathetic to and understanding of the peculiar nature of the community colleges should be a common goal of all of us here today. I.S.U. appears to be receiving a charge to develop such a degree (the D.A.) appropriate to junior college and/or to four-year college teaching. I hope that the next few years will witness many discussions within university faculties and between the universities and the community colleges as these doctoral degrees begin to jell.

Along this line, I would strongly recommend the guidelines in the report on the Preparation of Junior College Teachers and would urge that that report be made a part of the working papers of this conference. Perhaps this conference can establish guidelines for future conferences by discipline--similar to the one held here a few months ago in history--for discussions about this degree. I am convinced that it will become an acceptable degree only to the extent that both the producers and the users are involved in its planning.

An integral part of such a degree must be an internship. I would like to see the use of university classes and junior college classes for supervised internship experiences. These interns should be paid for the instruction they provide by the institution receiving that instruction at more than slave-market rates, and there must be enough university commitment that they are really supervised experiences with careful and thoughtful attention to the teaching process.

The University agenda for the 1970's should include then:

1. Departmental attention to graduate programs for college teachers.

   a. At the master's level toward initial employment as college teachers.

   b. Integrated post-master's programs, either formalized or not, following initial employment, which should include drive-in, extension, summer school and re[illegible]nt experiences.

   c. Integrated post-master's programs, either formalized or not, prior to initial employment.

   d. Continued attention to advanced graduate degrees other than the traditional Ph.D. which may be considered an acceptable and appropriate degree for college teaching in both junior and senior institutions.

2. Close coordination between the junior and senior institutions in the development of such programs. Conferences such as this one are essential. Conferences at the subject matter level will be even more productive. Topics for joint exploration should include:

   a. The extent of subject matter mastery.

   b. The nature and expansion of teaching internships.

   c. The peculiar needs of junior college teachers.

3. Careful attention to the recruitment of potential junior college teachers. One of the ethics of our profession is to attract those who will follow us. The increasing number of students who have attended junior colleges provide a rich reservoir for recruitment of teachers committed to junior college teaching.

4. Systematic articulation procedures between community colleges and universities similar to those currently practiced for transfer students but with particular attention to the implications upon the preparation of the teachers of those transfer students.

5. The establishment and growth at universities of such structures as our Center for Higher Education whose twin missions must be to establish and maintain a line of communication and information between the several colleges and departments of the universities and the community colleges and to address themselves throughout university faculties to the nature and improvement of the teaching-learning process. I hope that this conference has served toward that end.

VALEDICTORY

Fred L. Wellman
Executive Secretary
Illinois Junior College Board

On behalf of the Illinois Junior College Board and the community colleges of Illinois, I want to commend Illinois State University for sponsoring this conference and for establishing a program for preparing community college educators. It does indicate to us that you are interested in our needs and are willing to work with us--and we do appreciate that.

Last night, we heard Bob Poorman say that it is difficult for community colleges to predict exactly their enrollments and even the types of courses they will need to offer, particularly in view of the large number of part-time students we serve. This has some implications for our staffing needs, and it means that we must be quite flexible in the types of faculty teaching in the community colleges. It also means, in my judgment, that we must depend more and more upon generalists and not so much upon specialists. That is to say, for instance, that we will need people primarily in the field of world history as opposed to specialists in the history of Europe from 1920-1939. In whatever preparation programs you develop, the community college administrators probably would like to have more generalists.

Secondly, I think it also means that we need faculty who have both a major and a minor field so that we can be flexible in the type of assignments in which we can place our faculty. We also heard last night about the wide range of programs and students that we're serving and the great diversity among the community colleges. I think if I heard what Dr. Bond was saying, he was also stressing that point--that we in the community college have a much broader range of students to serve than you do at the university. We are trying to not only serve all the graduating high school class but many who didn't even graduate. So, we have to meet the needs of these people, and they are not only age 18 and 19 but 80 and in some cases 90. So, we are going to need faculty who are prepared to work in an institution that does have a broad range of offerings and a broad range of students. Therefore, we are quite pleased that you do have a course on the community college history, development, programs, philosophy, and purposes, and also have a course available on the needs and characteristics of students. I hope that you will include both courses in all of your programs for preparing community college educators, and that it would be part of the master's degree program.

This always reminds me, of course, of the tailor. Many of us as faculty members try to develop a course that is exactly the same for everyone. If a tailor tried to make all of his suits the same size, they just wouldn't fit very many persons. We should try to learn that principle. The quality of educational opportunity doesn't mean that we have to give all the patients exactly the same prescription nor different amounts of the same prescription. Yet, we as faculty members, who consider ourselves professionals, just don't seem to try to practice that very basic principle. So, what we are pleading for is for you to train teachers who will be able to do the type of thing we think is needed in community colleges--to serve the differing needs

and abilities of the students that we have. I would like to stress again the point that was made about not trying to make the community college faculty just like the four-year college faculty.

We also have needs for different types of faculty. The baccalaureate area, of course, is what many people think of when they see the word "college" in a title. That is not the only type of program we offer. We don't feel that the B.A. degree is the only way to heaven. There are many other ways. We heard this morning about the needs for faculty in general education, in the learning resources center, in the occupational-technical fields, and in adult and continuing education. We need those faculty probably more today than we do in the baccalaureate area. I am sure you are all aware of the fact that there is a reported surplus of faculty. I think when we talk about the surplus of faculty, we certainly can see that in the baccalaureate area. But, we have a shortage of faculty in some areas, particularly in some of the occupational-technical areas, in some of the learning resource laboratories, and in the developmental areas. Also, we have just begun to scratch the surface in the adult area, and we need faculty there. So, I would hope that you will be able to prepare such faculty; and, yet, I know that you are an institution with a program designed primarily for baccalaureate degrees and graduate degrees; so it is natural for you to prepare teachers who will come to the community colleges to prepare students for the baccalaureate degree. But that is not, in my judgment, a primary need. We need faculty in some of the non-baccalaureate-oriented areas and we hope you can prepare such faculty.

It should be stressed that we need faculty who are oriented to teaching and not so much to research. Yes, we do give some attention to research, we do conduct institutional research, and we occasionally have some organized research projects. But, that is not our major focus. Our major focus is in counseling and advising of students and in teaching students, and we need faculty who are so prepared. We can always get into that argument of whether we want subject matter teachers or method teachers. I would say we don't want either. We want them prepared with some of both so that they will know what to teach and how to teach. I get frustrated when I find out that a university has master's degree programs in which they are highly concentrated on subject matter, or they have M.Ed. programs that are highly concentrated on teaching methods. I would challenge you to develop a program, if you really want to help the community colleges, that will have obviously a strong base of subject matter context so we will know what to teach, but just as obviously that it will have a strong base on how to teach. I would hate to have a doctor who would know all there is about medicine but had never practiced before he conducted an operation on me. And, yet, we send teachers out that way--and we call ourselves professionals. We have a lot to do in this area, and you can provide some great leadership for us. In any program where you are dealing with community college faculty and staff, it should involve some seminars on teaching, some observation in the community colleges, and an internship--particularly for those with no previous experience in community colleges. This would be particularly helpful to us, and I would hope you would make these a part of your basic program whether it is at the master's degree level or beyond the master's degree.

This morning we heard that we can also anticipate a great variety of teaching strategies that are being used in some community colleges now, including some in Illinois. If we are going to have a faculty that is going to be effective, we will have to have them prepared to use a wide variety of teaching strategies. We want somebody that can work at teaching and we want somebody who can use a wide variety of teaching strategies to work with the variety of individuals and programs we will have in the community colleges in the future. So, we challenge you to be able to set up graduate level programs that are not all lecture and discussions and not with all the same size classes.

We have a saying that we like to think we are trying to make it easy for the student to learn the lesson, but we are not trying to make the lessons easy. We also think it is important to prepare faculty that can be held accountable for what is going on. We have only heard the word "accountable" mentioned once or twice in this conference. And, yet, it is something of which we are going to see much more. Before we can hold the teachers accountable for what they are doing with their students, we may have to hold the teacher-training institutions accountable for how they are preparing the teachers. Much of the blame for the failures of the public schools might be placed on the baccalaureate and graduate degree programs that prepare teachers. I realize in saying this that I am not apt to win too many friends in the university, but it is something we have to consider. We as administrators are going to have to be held accountable for what goes on in our institution. Our faculty members, I think, in the future, are going to have to be held accountable for what happens to their students. We always appear to blame the students for what happens, but I don't think we can always do that.

I participated in the English group discussion, and I think what was occurring there might be somewhat typical. It could be used as a brief example to illustrate some of the things I am trying to say. In the area of English, in practically every university preparing English faculty, you will find a heavy emphasis on the field of literature. Yet, when that faculty member goes to a community college, probably less than one-fourth, maybe none, of his work will be in the area of literature. What we need, for instance, in the area of English are faculty members in the fields of reading, composition, writing, speech, and listening, and yet universities are not preparing persons for these fields. The same could be said in other areas, possibly not as dramatically. What we are saying is don't try to prepare what you think we need or what you think we should be doing, but try to prepare what we actually need and are doing right now.

I also know that you have some concern about Master Plan III. We in the community colleges are probably not as directly affected as you are, but all of us will be affected in many ways by Master Plan III. I have some mixed emotions about the recommendations on specialist and doctoral programs (the Doctor of Arts program), because I am absolutely convinced we do need specialist and Doctor of Arts programs. On the other hand, I am not convinced that we need the type of specialist and Doctor of Arts programs that have been suggested or utilized in the past. Maybe MP III by questioning specialist degrees may ultimately help us develop what we really need in the area of the specialist degrees and a Doctor of Arts. We have some opportunities under what MP III may do for us to develop something that may be particularly helpful. Illinois State University could take the leadership in

exploring specialist and Doctor of Arts programs that would be developed in cooperation with all the universities in the State and the community colleges to prepare staff and faculty for us. It may be an external type degree or inter-institutional, inter-disciplinary type of program. It may be that a faculty member, for instance, would not have to come and spend all of his time in residency at Illinois State University to get the Doctor of Arts degree from Illinois State University--that we could develop some type of co-operative endeavor where a faculty member could get most of what he needs wherever he lives and works in the State of Illinois.

In closing, I wish to say that we would want to work with you and are willing to work with you. We hope that you will schedule more of the seminars as you did in the area of history recently. We are extremely pleased that:

1. you have set up this conference.

2. you are willing to listen to us.

3. you are willing to work with us in developing programs that will help us in teaching students in the community colleges.

DISCUSSION

A discussion period followed the presentation. A complete transcript of the questions and answers is not available. The following are excerpts taken from the tape recorder covering the general questioning period.

Question: A question came up in your last statement. You seemed to infer in the beginning that you wanted innovative teachers and, yet, in your last statement about cooperative degree programs, you seemed to want a standardization across the state. Would you clarify this please?

Answer: No, I wasn't thinking of standardization of the degrees. I was thinking that maybe there might be a Doctor of Arts degree offered in Illinois, hopefully not by the Board of Higher Education, that would be an inter-institutional degree. A student, let's say, from Chicago might take a lot of his work at Governors State or Chicago State, work occasionally with some of the people at Illinois State University, pick up work through educational television, attend workshops, seminars and be able to accomplish whatever we want to call a Doctor of Arts degree. I wasn't suggesting that SIU, ISU and the U. of I. all have exactly the same Doctor of Arts degree.

Question: On the subject of accountability, I wonder if you have any ideas about how and who will be involved and what will be involved in setting up the objectives for which the various institutions are going to be accountable?

Answer: I would say that if we don't do it, if we don't straighten up our own shop, it is very likely that at some point the citizens, taxpayers, and legislators of the State of Illinois will set up some agency to do this for us. If Illinois doesn't provide the types of people that we need, some agency is going to come along and do it for us. I would hope as professionals we could set up our own objectives. I would hope that if we are talking about objectives of preparing junior college faculty members, that this could be cooperatively done between the universities and community college people (administrators and faculty members). The whole problem of objectives just opens up many problems because our faculty, for instance, in the baccalaureate-oriented programs in the community colleges often are caught in a bind as to whether or not they are developing a program that will transfer to ISU, SIU, U. of I., etc. We have been holding articulation conferences that have tried to resolve some common goals and purposes in some of these courses. That, in a way, is getting at some common objectives and may be getting into the type of thing you have in mind.

Question: I just think the various kinds of students that you have to provide for within a community college makes the objective that you are aiming at widely varied as well. To prepare teachers for preparing those students to reach those objectives is a tremendously complex thing.

Answer: I hope, though, that you don't do like some old vocational people did in preparing students for a vocation that often

was out of existence when the student entered the job market. I would hope you are not trying to say you are going to try to prepare the specific objectives here at ISU. But, if you can tell them how to prepare objectives and how to be flexible to changing needs, that is what we are really asking for in our faculty.

Question: In Master Plan Phase III, there is a prediction that our enrollments are going to decrease. If this is true, then this would have serious implications for how much staffing we need to represent the state, especially on a permanent basis.

Answer: I would agree that we are going to have an enrollment problem if we try to operate the same types of programs for the same groups of individuals we are now serving. I think, though, we have in our society a large reservoir of individuals who are crying for some type of education. If we can develop the programs to meet their needs, we are going to have more students than we can handle. Obviously, if we are going to concentrate just on high school graduates, there aren't going to be that many high school graduates to keep enrollments increasing. But, when you think of all the adults we could serve, the prospective enrollments are there.

Comment from Audience: You mentioned the extensive differences between university faculty and junior college faculty. University faculties have been geared for generations now to handle the education of the upper quarter, or it may be the upper eighth now in California. Junior college faculty are geared to handle everybody--all of God's children. There is a revolution going on today and that revolution is going to be felt more severely in the universities if they don't change than in the community colleges. You have got to start thinking about all of God's children! You have got to stop thinking about the elite, and we have got to train teachers that have hearts and feelings. They are not going to all be baccalaureate oriented, and we have got to see that this vast, technical country--U.S.A.--has a dimension for everyone. We have got to face this fact and go forth and do it. This summer, the Ph.D. graduates were frustrated and couldn't get what they were trained for, whereas the community college graduate got jobs better paying than Ph.D. graduates in the occupational areas. One of our graduates got $14,500 as a starter in programming.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The seminar participants met in small discussion groups subsequent to each general session. The following reports reflect the content of several of those meetings. Some sections did not submit written reports.

GROUP DISCUSSION - ADMINISTRATION

The Thursday evening group discussion on administration was chaired by Dr. Alan Hickrod of Illinois State University. The session was opened with some general comments by Dr. Hickrod and a review of recent research completed at Illinois State University through the Doctoral Program in Educational Administration. Three different subject areas were considered from the administrative viewpoint.

The first area was on faculty tenure. Questions were raised as to the value of tenure policies in the community colleges and as to whether they enhance or inhibit the growth of junior colleges. Questions were raised on what actually brought about the need for a tenure policy in the institution. Concern was also illustrated in what makes up job security of a college - whether it is a climate that is established within the institution or whether a strong tenure policy satisfies this end.

The second area discussed was in teacher evaluation. There was a discussion of the various procedures that are used in the institutions that were represented and the purposes of the teacher evaluative processes. Procedures in the evaluation were discussed as they related to teachers, students, and administrators.

The third area was the training and experience of instructors. The general consensus exists that the Ph.D. does not necessarily insure quality education. The Ph.D. has such a heavy research orientation and the junior colleges do not feel the need for this aspect of training in their personnel. There was evidence that the broad background within the faculty member was of greatest importance. Many faculty members are placed in a position of utility men in the junior colleges, as they are often required to go to their second field of academic endeavor. There is no one specific criteria of how to select personnel, but it was felt that the administration had to make a decision many times on how the new faculty member fit in and blended with the present faculty. Considerable discussion was based upon the budgetary limitations as a factor in teacher recruitment.

The Friday session was chaired by Dr. Charles Edwards of Illinois State University and the discussions centered around the role of the university in pre-training and in-service training of faculty members to meet the needs of the community college. There appeared to be general consensus that the training of faculty in narrow fields is undesirable and that there is some need for general background. The field of English was most actively discussed and there emerged a point of view that the English preparation currently found in Master's degree programs was centered around the field of literature when the junior colleges had a great need for faculty who had their emphasis in composition.

The discussion ensued on ways that the university could provide assistance to the community colleges in training vocational faculty to improve instruction. It was suggested that the junior colleges and universities might consider the military model of providing instruction.

The junior colleges and universities might consider the military model of providing instruction. Chenute Air Force Base has a training center that has developed many programs for training members of the armed services. Consideration was given to the university providing a consultant to be shared with the various junior colleges of the state. This would provide for some short-term training and then on-location visits as a consultant to the vocational faculty. Any program that would be developed should be designed to serve the improvement of the instructional processes in vocational and technical training. It was suggested that a consortium among colleges may be the best approach in meeting the needs of upgrading the instruction for the vocational faculty.

Some grants may be available for this type of program for the improvement of instruction. Dr. Edwards indicated that Illinois State University would be willing to investigate the possibilities of obtaining such a grant. It was suggested that the university should develop a program that would be particularly effective in preparing vocational teachers who perhaps had not received extensive formal education. People from business and industry that understand training processes could be employed by the university to work with vocational faculties and that the program be taken off campus.

Considerable discussion was generated around the university providing some degrees partially through equivalent experiences. The university should investigate equivalent degree programs. Recommendations for these programs should be jointly proposed to the Board of Higher Education by the Illinois Junior College Board and one or all of the governing boards of the state universities. The purpose of this type of degree or training experience would be to provide a vehicle in which the junior college vocational faculty could achieve, by their experience in business and industry, an academic standing. There was considerable discussion surrounding this approach. There were those who felt that the junior college itself had the ability to recognize experience and pay their faculty accordingly.

It was suggested that the junior college personnel should communicate their ideas regarding all aspects of their relationship between community colleges and the universities to the presidents and deans to assist them in making university decisions. Fear was also expressed that the junior college was taking on university model in their process of becoming recognized.

It was strongly suggested that the Associate Degree in Arts and Sciences be accepted as meeting the general education requirements of the first two years of a baccalaureate degree.

GROUP DISCUSSION - BUSINESS

Question: What seems to be the enrollment trends in the area of business?

In the transfer programs, the greatest increase in the number of students and, therefore, the greatest needs for teachers is in the areas of Accounting and Introduction to Business.

In the terminal programs, by far the greatest growth is in the area of Data Processing. In fact, this area is greater than the transfer area.

The Secretarial Science area is smaller than originally anticipated in forecasts for junior colleges.

In the area of Business Administration, there are heavy enrollments, and these heavy enrollments are anticipated to continue in those introductory courses which are transferable to baccalaureate programs.

Question: In general, what do you anticipate to be the make-up of your student body in business?

It is highly probable that at least one-half of the total number of students will be part-time students. There is and will continue to be a wide age range in each. There is and will continue to be a wide range in the area of business experience that the students have had. A large portion of the students are enrolled in transfer programs as opposed to terminal programs.

Question: What type of faculty do you anticipate using in 1975?

It is anticipated that a large number of part-time faculty will be used. These part timers will be persons fully employed in some local business. There is a heavy emphasis on practical business experience for all business teaching staff. There are some areas of business which are such that only one section of a course may be offered per year. Thus, a full-time special degree person is generally not needed. Part-time staff can be used to fill the position. For example, in the area of Finance the course might be taught by either a part-time faculty member or a faculty member who has his degree in something other than Finance.

Question: To what extent do the junior colleges prefer to have a specialized degree?

A new small junior college will prefer to have faculty members with a broad, rather than specialized, background. A larger or more established junior college has more need for faculty who are specialized; in other words, combinations may be needed in a new program, but as the program expands more specialization may be desirable.

Question: What balance between content and teaching methodology would be desirable?

Heavy emphasis should be placed on content courses. About two courses (six semester hours) may satisfy the teaching methodology.

It was strongly recommended that some type of junior college internship be a required part of the education to be a junior college teacher.

Question: What type of in-service programs should be carried out?

A teacher with a specialized degree may want the University to provide some type of course or seminar to bolster a teacher in a second teaching area.

It was suggested that the University might want to provide a team to teach junior college teachers on site. For example, two or three teachers from the area of Management might conduct a Management Seminar at a junior college.

Question: What can Illinois State University do for minority staffing?

This is a difficult problem. It is difficult for a non-ghetto individual to truly understand the ghetto problem. Reading from a book and talking about the problem is not equipping a staff member to understand the problem. Perhaps the best way to handle the problem is to provide more assistance for those persons who have experience living and working in a ghetto area.

Question: Although a Master's degree is required now for teaching in a transfer program, what will be the requirements by 1975 or 1980?

The requirement will probably be something higher than a Master's degree such as a Master's plus 30 hours. It is entirely possible that a different type of Master's degree may need to be developed specifically with the junior college in mind. This Master's degree may include some hours of teaching methodology. The Master's degree may include some hours regarding the philosophy of the junior college and the general make-up of its students. The new Master's degree may require actual teaching experience on an internship basis in a junior college.

Question: Where does statistics and economics fit in?

These courses, when taught in the business area, will be a second teaching area.

GROUP DISCUSSION - HUMANITIES

Question: How can boards be persuaded of the importance of humanities in community college curricula?

Boards need to be brought into the 20th Century.

Question: What kind of courses in humanities should be taught in humanities?

Art, music, philosophy, literature--a central core on team-teaching basis. A very basic foundation on which later programs can build.

Question: What are the humanities? Does it include the arts?

A problem is what is transferable into senior universities. It may be a mistake to look primarily at what the senior colleges require. We should not try to impose a single concept of what constitutes a philosophy or art course or sequence on either junior or senior colleges. There is a diversity of programs in senior schools and there is no reason why this should be changed or why it should not also be so in junior colleges. The problem of transferring credit is not really a great problem.

Question: Is the humanities teacher in the community college prepared and capable of dealing with non-baccalaureate students?

In some community colleges, it is easier to enroll people in humanities and liberal arts courses than in vocationally-oriented courses. This is often true among students from disadvantaged backgrounds. This is due to a general image fostered on the public which associates success with education and education with liberal arts rather than vocational-technical training.

There are advantages in having comprehensive community colleges which include both baccalaureate training and vocational-technical training because (1) vocational-technical students need some exposure to the humanities, and (2) it opens up greater options to students and avoids locking them into programs.

Question: What would people in community colleges like to see people in senior colleges do?

One community college representative thinks there has been too much articulation in specific areas in community colleges. They become too specialized for community colleges which should provide more of a general background.

Question: What kind of training is required for faculty?

Some have doctorate, others just master's. Some with experience, some without, but the primary interest is in the individual who can teach well and who wants to teach well. A primary criterion for advancement for teachers in community colleges is teaching excellence. Also look for people with ability to teach not only in his special area but also in related areas.

Question: What areas are typically related, if any?

A variety of combinations.

Question: Would there be any value in exchanging faculty members between community colleges and senior colleges to promote greater acquaintance and cooperation among the senior and junior colleges?

Yes, if it is done right, it would be very valuable.

PARTICIPANTS

Illinois Junior Colleges

Black Hawk College
- Alban E. Reid, President
- Donald L. Anderson

College of DuPage
- James L. Heinselman

State Community College of East St. Louis
- Clifton J. Woods, II, President
- Burena Howard
- William Hufker
- James Jennings
- Frank Lyerson
- Willard Maytubby
- Geraldine Thomas
- Rosetta D. Wheadon
- Kenneth Wright

Elgin Community College
- Gilbert I. Renner, President
- Edwin T. Schulz

William Rainey Harper College
- John A. Lucas
- Omar L. Olson

Highland Community College
- Kenneth E. Borland, President

Illinois Central College
- Kenneth L. Edwards, President
- Andreas A. Paloumpis

Illinois Eastern Junior Colleges
Lincoln Trail College
- Joseph C. Piland, President

Illinois Valley Community College
- R. Earl Trobaugh, President

Joliet Junior College
- Douglas G. Graham, President

Kaskaskia College
- Virgil I. Bolerjack

Lake Land College
- Virgil H. Judge, President
- John Helton

Lewis and Clark Community College
J. D. Schweitzer

Lincoln Land Community College
Robert L. Poorman, President

John A. Logan College
Nathan A. Ivey, President
Norman K. Myers

McHenry County College
Richard Fuhler
Marvin H. Lieske

Moraine Valley Community College
Robert E. Turner, President
Harold Boadway

Parkland College
William M. Staerkel, President
Phillip R. Walker

Rock Valley College
Karl Jacobs, President

Carl Sandburg College
Eltis F. Henson, President
F. William Kelley

Sauk Valley College
Edward J. Sabol, President

Shawnee Junior College
Loren E. Klaus, President

Thornton Community College
J. Philip Dalby, President

Triton College
Herbert Zeitlin, President
Eugene Schlabach

Waubonsee Community College
Forest D. Etheredge, President
Kenneth W. Allen
Lee Thompson
Kenneth E. Shibata

Illinois State University

Richard Bond, Vice President and Dean of Faculties
Richard Desmond, Director, Center for Higher Education
Arlan Helgeson, Dean, Graduate School
Joe Kraus, Director, Libraries
Francis LaFave, Student Services
Elden Lichty, Retired Professor of Education
Gerald W. Smith, Professor of Higher Education
Ralph Smith, Director, Radio and Television

College of Applied Science and Technology
- Charles Porter, Dean
- James McBee, Jr., Chairman, Agriculture
- Wayne H. Jepson, Director, Allied Health Professions
- Virginia Crafts, Health and P. E. Women
- Wayne Truex, Health and P. E. Men
- Blossom Johnson, Head, Home Economics
- Joe Talkington, Chairman, Industrial Technology
- Claude Bell, Industrial Technology
- Roger Blomgren, Industrial Technology
- John Johnston, Industrial Technology
- Larry Quane, Industrial Technology

College of Arts and Sciences
- Robert Chasson, Biological Sciences
- Sol Shulman, Head, Chemistry
- Ron Cook, Chemistry
- Frederick Firestone, Chairman, Economics
- Fred Kroeger, English
- Douglas Nietzke, English
- Pasquale Di Pasquale, English
- A. Gordon Ferguson, Foreign Languages
- Eric Johnson, Geography-Geology
- Earl Reitan, Chairman, History
- Roger Champagne, History
- Charles Gray, Jr., History
- Clyde McCormick, Head, Mathematics
- Kenneth Kennard, Chairman, Philosophy
- H. Gene Blocker, Philosophy
- G. Stanley Kane, Philosophy
- Harold Born, Head, Physics
- Robert Young, Physics
- R. D. Gillespie, Political Science
- Walter Friedhoff, Head, Psychology
- William Gnagey, Psychology
- Ollie Pocs, Sociology-Anthropology
- William Arnold, Speech Communication

College of Business
Robert Mitchell, Dean
Raymond Esworthy, Head, Accounting
James A. Hallam, Accounting
Thomas Secoy, Accounting
C. Richard Decker, Chairman, Business Administration
Arthur Adams, Business Administration
Peter Couch, Business Administration
Warren Perry, Head, Business Education
Thomas Martin, Business Education

College of Education
Leo Eastman, Chairman, Education
H. Twyman Jones, Education
Henry C. Johnson, Education
Dent M. Rhodes, Education
Charles W. Edwards, Educational Administration
G. Alan Hickrod, Educational Administration
Geraldine Fergen, Special Education
Dean S. Hage, Special Education

College of Fine Arts
Charles Bolen, Dean
Fred V. Mills, Chairman, Art
Robert Stefl, Art
James Roderick, Chairman, Music
Calvin Pritner, Director, Theatre
John Kirk, Theatre

Others

Fred L. Wellman, Executive Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board
Don Mortvedt, Associate Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board
C. Loyd Shubert, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota
Richard Paulson, Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota